

GOVERNORS' HEAD HAILS REAGAN PLAN

Snelling Applauds Transfer of
U.S. Programs but Urges
Minimum Welfare Level

By EDWARD C. BURKS

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Jan. 31 — The chairman of the National Governors' Association, Richard A. Snelling of Vermont, today hailed President Reagan's plan to transfer more than 40 Federal programs to state control but added that the Administration should establish a "humane minimum standard" of aid before turning over major welfare responsibilities.

Appearing on the NBC News program "Meet the Press," Governor Snelling, a Republican, responded to criticism that many states would not be able to maintain payments at current levels and that the result would be migration of the poor to states with higher payment levels. Mr. Snelling proposed the minimum payment standard and added: "I believe it can do that and also assure a fiscal capacity in such a way that there would be no need for this so-called voting with the feet."

The Governor said that it was "quite possible" that the program would require Federal assistance to some states. "I don't think the President has proposed a total removal of the Federal Government from its obligations to assure justice," he said.

But he insisted that turning over welfare payments, primarily the huge Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, had broad support among



Dr. Frank Press, the president of the National Academy of Sciences, would like a softening of restrictions on visiting Soviet scientists.

governors on a nonpartisan basis because the states could "more appropriately earmark" the funds.

New Rule Taking Effect

WASHINGTON, Jan. 31 (UPI) — Thousands of people classified as "working poor" will be forced off the welfare rolls by a change in the rules this week that could make it more profitable in some states to quit a job than to keep it.

The change is among a set of rules aimed at ending benefits for 408,000 families and trimming assistance for 279,000 others under Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the nation's major welfare program.

The rule lowers the limit on "disregards" — the expenses that working recipients may deduct from their income in determining eligibility for benefits.

Administration Trying to Reconcile Scientific and Security Interests

By ROBERT REINHOLD

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Jan. 31 — Intensive efforts are being made here to reach a compromise under which American technical and scientific data that are unclassified but of potential military and industrial value can be kept from the Soviet Union and other foreign nations without destroying freedom of communication in scientific research.

The issue has caused divisions in the Reagan Administration, according to Government science officials and university representatives. They say that research officials in the Defense Department and other agencies are attempting to fight off proposals that they feel may unwittingly undermine American academic science in the interest of pursuing a narrow concept of "national security."

No early resolution is expected because the issue poses a difficult problem. On the one hand, Government officials say that American science is so open that there is substantial "leakage" of ideas to Soviet visitors. On the other, scientists say it is the very openness of American academic life, in which research and teaching are closely integrated, that underlies the scientific edge this country enjoys over the Soviet Union in most fields of study.

Philosophical Problems

The matter has raised some thorny philosophical problems, compounded by differing concepts of what constitutes applied research, as opposed to basic research. Many scientists say it is comparatively easy to define national security when it comes to products and devices but not in the more abstract commodities of ideas and teaching, especially now that the line between academic and industrial research is becoming blurred by growing cooperation between schools and major companies.

Although restrictions on Soviet scientists were tightened under President Carter after the Soviet incursion into Afghanistan two years ago, recent public comments by intelligence and military officials of the current Administration urging American scientists to accept controls on publication of their work and contact with foreign scientists have stirred foreboding in the scientific community, as has more vigorous use of export control laws by the Commerce Department to restrict contacts with Soviet and Chinese scholars and students. But others in and out of the Government are quietly working to prevent any rupture between the Government and academic scientists.

Earlier this month, for example, Stanford University said in a press release that it would not enforce State Department-imposed restrictions on Nikolay V. Umnov, a visiting Soviet robotics expert. But by last week Stanford was engaged in discussions with the National Academy of Sciences, which operates the exchanges for the Government, to work out a compromise with the State Department to permit the Umnov visit.

Clear Guidelines Sought

Meanwhile, at the Defense Department, Dr. Richard D. De Lauer, the Under Secretary for research and engineering, is reported to be fighting efforts by other Pentagon officials for stringent controls over a wide range of scientific research. His position is likely to be bolstered with a just-completed report to Congress by a committee of the Defense Science Board, an advisory panel of civilian scientists headed by Dr. Ivan L. Bennett, dean of the New York University Medical Center. The report recommends that clear guidelines be established to distinguish basic research from more practical know-how needing protection as potentially sensitive.

Dr. Frank Press, president of the Na-

tional Academy of Sciences, is negotiating with the State Department to soften its restrictions on visiting Soviet scientists.

While Communist visitors have long been placed under restrictions, apparently accepted by Stanford and other schools in the past, Government utterances suggesting a crackdown, or urging more caution, seem to have heightened academic sensitivities.

Last week, officials at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology said they had balked at curbs placed on the visit of a Russian organic chemist, Mikhail Gololobov, to the school's department of nutrition and food science. The State Department ordered that he "shall not be exposed to work there on nutritional research." Since that is all the department does, M.I.T. officials expressed outrage.

A State Department official, who declined to be identified, said that the concern was to bar the visitor from seeing certain "genetic engineering" work at M.I.T. Nevin Scrimshaw, head of the department, said no such work was done at the institute. The State Department replied that the curbs were "not carved into stone" and that the agency was "capable of moderating" them if approached by the school.

Other Government officials indicated that such restrictions had more to do with Washington's sanctions against the Soviet Union than with containing knowledge at M.I.T.'s nutrition department, which has students from 20 foreign countries. That argument may have been strengthened last Tuesday by the State Department's decision to ban Yuri Kaprolov, who is a Soviet arms control expert, not a research scientist, from a public debate at Stanford only a week after excluding Mr. Umnov.

The Commerce Department has been attempting to exert control over universities under its authority to license the export of "technical data." In an inter-

view, Bogdan Denysyk, Deputy Assistant Secretary for export administration, said that he was not trying to control basic research, only applied work that is "not far from being a product."

"We are simply applying to universities what industry has been subjected to for years," he said. "Universities do research in applied areas — it is proprietary." He cited Government-financed work on automated machine tools, saying, "That is very applied; we use robots for making nuclear weapons."

Scientists have contended that it was absurd to try to contain knowledge on college campuses. "Any control system is not watertight," said Mr. Denysyk. "This is just a filter that gives us a lead time. You are not going to stop it, you are going to delay it."

A White House science official who requested anonymity said that if scientists accepted grants and contracts from military agencies, they should accept "reasonable" restraints, just as they do when consulting for private business. He argued that their fears were overplayed. "The question is how to find a reasonable trade-off between the Government interest in national security and individual rights to exchange ideas. There is no absolute right to exchange of scientific information."

Plea for Open Inquiry

Such comments have not mollified academic leaders. "Free and open inquiry is absolutely essential if we are to maintain our scientific leadership," said Gerald J. Lieberman, vice provost of Stanford.

Dr. Press said that universities could not be expected to compartmentalize visitors and that the Government should deny visas to certain foreign scientists if it is nervous about them. He argued that exchanges should be limited to fields in which the Soviet Union and the United States are equal, which he said makes